

REMARKS

As an RCE is being filed herewith, it is respectfully requested that this amendment be entered and considered at this time.

Applicants will address each of the Examiner's rejections in the order in which they appear in the Final Rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC §112

In the Final Rejection, the Examiner rejects Claims 26-30 and 43-47 under 35 USC §112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

In particular, the Examiner states that there is no support in the specification as originally filed for, in the claimed context, the nozzle and the first and second pixel electrodes are connected by a single application liquid. While Applicants disagree, in order to advance the prosecution of this application, Applicants have amended Claim 26 to be dependent on Claim 6 and to no longer include the objection to language and have canceled Claims 27-30 and 43-47 without prejudice or disclaimer. As none of the pending claims have the objected to language, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC §103

Claims 6, 10-12, 19-20, 22-25, 31, 33-37 and 39-42

The Examiner also rejects Claims 6, 10-12, 19-20, 22-25, 31, 33-37 and 39-42 under 35

USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Miyashita et al. (WO 98/24271 - English equivalent, US Patent No. 2002/0041926) in view of Horike (US 4,281,332), Iguchi (WO 98/27579 - English equivalent, US Patent No. 2002/0009536) and Kasubuchi et al. (US 3,878,517). This rejection is also respectfully traversed.

While Applicants traverse this rejection, in order to advance the prosecution of this application, Applicants have amended independent Claim 6 to recite “discharging liquid comprising an organic light-emitting material to a pixel column over a substrate from a nozzle by contacting a contact element attached to the nozzle to a bank” (emphasis added). This is shown, for example, in the present application in Figs. 13B, 13C. See also pages 39-40 of the specification. It is respectfully submitted that this feature is not disclosed or suggested by the cited references.

Applicants note that in the Final Rejection, the Examiner contends that “‘579 teaches that when depositing electroluminescent material between partition walls of EL display ([0001]-[0003]), it is desirable to maintain a constant distance between the substrate and the nozzles, and that such distance may be maintained by an element in contact with the partitions ([0246]-[0249]).” Even if this is true (which Applicants do not admit), ‘579 does not disclose or suggest discharging liquid from a nozzle by contacting a contact element to a bank, as recited in amended independent Claim 6. Rather, at most, ‘579 teaches that the contact sensor is used to maintain a constant distance between the substrate and the nozzles, and is not used for the claimed step of discharging liquid.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the cited references do not disclose or suggest the method of independent Claim 6 or those claims dependent thereon. Therefore, the claims are patentable over the cited references, and it is respectfully requested that this rejection be

withdrawn.

Claims 7, 21, 32 and 38

The Examiner also rejects Claims 7, 21, 32 and 38 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Miyashita in view of Horike, Iguchi, Kasubuchi and further in view of Fujimura. This rejection is also respectfully traversed.

Claim 7 is a dependent claim. Accordingly, it is patentable over the cited references for at least the reasons discussed above for independent Claim 6. Claims 21, 32 and 38 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer.

Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 26, 28-30, 43 and 45-47

Claims 26, 28-30, 43 and 45-47 are rejected as being unpatentable over Miyashita in view of Horike, Iguchi, and Kasubuchi and further in view of Kurosawa et al. (US 6,057,647). This rejection is also respectfully traversed.

Claim 26 is a dependent claim. Accordingly, it is patentable over the cited references for at least the reasons discussed above for independent Claim 6. Claims 28-30, 43 and 45-47 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer.

Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 27 and 44

Claims 27 and 44 are rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Miyashita

in view of Horike, Iguchi and Kasubuchi and further in view of Kurosawa and further in view of Fujimura. This rejection is also respectfully traversed.

Claims 27 and 44 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

New Claims

Applicants are adding new Claims 48-51 herewith. Each of these claims is a dependent claim. Accordingly, each is patentable over the cited references for at least the reasons discussed above for independent Claim 6. Therefore, it is respectfully requested that these claims be entered and allowed.

It is not believed that a fee is due for these new claims. If a fee should be due, please charge our deposit account 50/1039.

Information Disclosure Statement

Applicants are preparing an information disclosure statement (IDS) and will submit it in the near future. It is respectfully requested that this IDS be entered and considered prior to the issuance of any further action for this application.


Conclusion

Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is now in an allowable condition and should be allowed.

Please charge our deposit account 50/1039 for any further fee for this amendment.

Favorable reconsideration is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,


Mark J. Murphy
Registration No. 34,225

COOK, ALEX, McFARRON, MANZO,
CUMMINGS & MEHLER, LTD.
200 West Adams Street
Suite 2850
Chicago, Illinois 60606
(312) 236-8500

Customer no. 000026568